Tuesday, 9 July, 1946

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL
FOR THE FAR EAST
Court House of the Tribunal
War Ministry Building
Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

Appearances:

For the Tribunal, same as before with the exception of HON. DELFIN JARANILLA, Justice, Member from the Commonwealth of the Philippines, who is not sitting.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except OKAWA and HIRANUMA who are represented by their counsel.

Does any counsel desire to mention any matter?

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: May it please the Tribunal -
THE PRESIDENT: Captain Kleiman.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: With reference to the defendant HIRANUMA, I visited him on Saturday and he had a fever and a cold and was suffering with indigestion. This morning I am advised that his condition is much worse. On Saturday I had spoken to one of the doctors who was treating him, and I was advised there that the facilities — they didn't have all of the facilities with which to treat him. We thought it most advisable to wait until Monday morning to see what would happen with respect to the defendant's condition. I found out this morning that his condition is very much worse. I didn't have time to make a written application; I respectfully make an oral application to remove the defendant HIRANUMA from Sugamo Prison to Tokyo Imperial Hospital.

THE PRESIDENT: It will have to be supported by a medical certificate when it is made, made in

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Chambers. You will have to meet all of the requirements that were insisted upon and met in the case of OKAWA as regards the transfer from one hospital to another. The application will be made in Chambers and not in Court. CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: I am awaiting a medical certificate, may it please your Honor, and will make the application in Court some time in the course of the day, sir. THE PRESIDENT: "In Chambers," I said. CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: I mean in Chambers, excuse me, sir. MR. OKAMOTO: May I continue my cross-examination? CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) BY MR. OKAMOTO: The witness said that in the years 1935 to 1936 he had travelled in North China, was that so? THE MONITOR: Correction: "From December 1935 to January 1936, he travelled through North China, is that correct?" I did not say that I travelled between December

24

25

Q From the record it is known that General

and January. I said that I had travelled between

December 25 and January 5.

DOHIHARA left Hsinking for Peking on the sixth of July, 1936.

THE MONITOR: Are you aware of that?

Yes, I do recall that on the fifth of July I had dinner with Major General DOHIHARA, Chief of Staff ITAGAKI and one other, that is, a party of four, at a restaurant in Hsinking to send off General DOHIHARA to Peking.

When did you say, was it January or July?

January 5, on the night of the New Year banquet:

Q Isn't there a lapse of memory of the witness? You were, you arrived from Peking to Hsinking on the seventh of January.

Yes, I was on a trip, an official trip which was to end on the seventh of January; but because of an urgent telegram, I returned on the fifth.

Well, this question will be decided, will be studied later on the record; but I should like to ask you another question. You said that you were, you knew that General DOHIHARA -- that you knew of General DOHIHARA's mission to Peking by what you heard from General MINAMI. However, yesterday, you stated that you had yourself written the order for General DOHIHARA's mission and it was that way that you knew

12

16

17

19

23

about it. Isn't there a difference between these two things?

THE MONITOR: Correction in the first portion:
"You told the prosecutor that you had learned of Major
General DOHIHARA's mission in going to Peking at the
time when you were present at a meeting between General MINAMI and General DOHIHARA where General DOHIHARA made a report on his trip."

A With respect to that first testimony, I did not say that I had learned when DOHIHARA returned from his mission and reported to General Headquarters of the Kwantung Army. With respect to drawing up the instructions given to General DOHIHARA, considerable controversy took place in that various and conflicting opinions were given and, for that reason, the contents of the instructions were not decided with dispatch. This difficulty arose because it was found difficult to decide as to what should become the fixed motive in starting the Autonomy Movement in North China.

THE MONITOR: Correction: "Fixed objective" instead of "motive."

A (Continuing) If my memory is correct, the first instructions were that in establishing an autonomous area there was no ideological objective, so to speak. It was necessary to have that and, as I recall,

-	Major General DOHIHARA, Major General SASAKI and Major
-	General ITAGAKI, these three men studied this matter,
1	and in addition to the objective of just creating
	an autonomous area, they added anti-Communism as a
-	sort of a slogan for the purpose of this program.
-	Q Wasn't the witness travelling in North China
1	at the time?
-	A I think the drafting of the instructions
-	took place towards the end of September. I was not
	travelling at that time.
-	THE MONITOR: Correction: "Middle part of
	September."
	Q But does the witness know of the instructions
1	which were sent from Central Headquarters and of which
	I have spoken yesterday.
-	THE MONITOR: Correction: "Instructions
-	given by cable."
	A Yes, I know that very well.
	Q Then should it not be interpreted that General
	DOHIHARA's mission to North China was not on General
	MINAMI's initiative but on orders from Headquarters?
	A As to this so-called "order" from the Central
	Army authorities, this was merely a formality inasmuch

as this was initiated not in Tokyo but by the Kwantung

Army; and by the end of September, Major DOHIHARA was

3

4

7

8

9

13

14

19

21

24

25

tung Army.

already in Peking and had commenced upon the Autonomy Movement. THE MONITOR: Slight addition: "As I said vesterday." A (Continuing) That General DOHIHARA, an officer attached to the Kwantung Army, should start activities in an area under the jurisdiction of the Japanese Army in North China under the command of General TADA was a matter which General TADA disliked 10 extremely. 11 Q Were the relations between the North China 12 Army and the Kwantung Army at that time harmonious or not? Frankly speaking, Generals DOHIHARA and 15 TADA were not on friendly terms personally but, as I 16 recall, they were in complete agreement with respect 17 to the creation of an autonomous area with the five 13 North China provinces. Q I would like to ask you a very elementary. 20 question: Is the North China Army under the jurisdiction of the Kwantung Army? 22 They are entirely separate. The North 25 China garrison is not under the command of the Kwan-

Q Under whose orders does the North China Army

1	operate?
2	THE MONITOR: Correction: "Under whose
3	orders does the commanding officer of the North China
4	Army operate?
5	A With respect to the Supreme Command, the
6	Chief of the Army General Staff; with respect to
7	military administration, the Minister of War.
8	Q On personnel matters, then, he is under the
9	direction of the Minister of War?
0	A Yes.
1	Q Who was the Prime Minister of the Japanese
L.	Government at that time?
13	A Admiral OKADA, Keisuke, retired reserve.
4	Q And the War Minister?
15	A General HAYASHI, Senjuro on the active list.
16	Q And the Chief of Staff?
17	A Prince Kokohito Kan-in.
ls.	Q The witness has just said that, concerning
19	matters in North China, there was a notion of anti-
20	Communism. How were matters standing in 1935?
21	A What kind of situation are you referring to?
2.7	Q Was the Chinese Communist Party active in
25	North China at that time?
24	A Communists and the Communist army had infil-
25	trated into North China.

24

How was it in the interior of Manchuria? 1 Yes, Communists and Communist guerrillas, 2 there was quite a large number of them in Manchuria. 3 The witness, who was famous as Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army, who was versed in China affairs, has this witness made any suggestions to his superiors on this matter? 7 THE MONITOR: Correction: "The witness, as 8 one of the staff officers of the Kwantung Army, he 9 was very familiar with Chinese affairs. Has 10 he ever made any recommendations in regard to the 11 1.7 Communist guerrillas?" 13 A Yes. 14 What recommendations have you made? 0 15 They were very important recommendations. According to my recollections, half of the province 17 of Shansi was about to be completely occupied by the Communists. From that time the advocacy of the Com-18 munist Army was "Resist Japan and Save the Country!"

Up to that time the contentions of the Communist Army was "anti" free peoples' principle and save the country.

Q Please give your conclusions rapidly.

Well, you cannot state conclusions without giving an opinion.

MR. SACKETT: If the Court please, the

prosecution does not see the relevancy of this line of questioning.

THE PRESIDENT: It is very difficult to see how relevant it is. I had the impression, perhaps the wrong one, that these questions were being asked only for the sake of asking them. I would remind counsel that he has a duty to his client to put only those questions that may adduce helpful answers.

Many of the questions yesterday and today
put by this counsel were directed to ascertaining or
determining the credibility of the witness; but the
purpose of these questions is to get information,
the value of which I am not clear about. But I can
only give that warning to counsel that his duty is
to elicit answers that will assist his client and not
to ask questions merely for the sake of asking them.

Q Is the presence and activities of the Communist guerrillas not the reason for which the Kwantung Army and the North China Army tried --

THE MONITOR: "Tried for creation of an area of peace in North China."

A Rather, the purpose was to create an autonomous area in North China which was to have been closely interwoven in their relationships with Manchuria. But, as counsel has just stated, I am also positive that an

anti-Communist stand as a means of countering the threat of Communist guerrilla activities was one of the purposes for which this area of peace was being projected. THE MONITOR: Slight correction: "The purpose was creation of an autonomous area which would cooperate with Japan and Manchukuo."

Abram & Mors

6

7

8

9

13

14

19

24

25

Q Were the limits of Manchuria extended during General MINAMI's tenure of office?

MONITOR: Correction: Manchukuo instead of Manchuria.

A No. However, I might add that in the southwest part of Jehol Province there was one Hsien which
was contested between Manchuria and China as to which
this particular Hsien should belong. As a result of
these controversies an investigation was conducted
jointly by the Hopeh-Chahar Council and Manchukuo.
As a result of this investigation this Hsien was
attached to Manchukuo as being an historical part
thereof.

MONITOR: Hopeh-Chahar Regime instead of Hopeh-Chahar Council.

Q I have heard that General MINAMI, since he took office as Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army, had always sustained that no dispute should arise with foreign countries.

MONITOR: Correction: he has always instructed his subordinates.

A Yes. Not foreign countries, but he was very positive against the creation of any disputes along the frontiers with the Soviet Union.

Q And how was it with the kepublic of China?

2

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

Eri.

16

13

20

21

22

23

24

25

The most important aspect of the project carried on by Major General DOHIHARA in connection with the Autonomy Movement of the five North China provinces -- with the progress of the Autonomy Movement in the North China provinces -- was to eliminate friction between Japan and China. Were the opinions of Major General DOHIHARA based on the views of General MINAMI?

A Yes.

Then can it be interpreted that with what the witness has been saying up to now means that the Autonomous Movement in North China was not meant to cause friction or a dispute with China, but to bring about peaceful relations between the two, China and Japan?

A Not once since I appeared on this witness stand have I said that this Autonomy Movement was calculated to cause friction or dispute with China.

Does the witness know how General MINAMI was recommended to be Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army?

Yes; not very well, but I do know.

Is it not because General MINAMI, as one of the elder generals, was not -- the opinions of General HINAMI were not positive, but they were

11

12

13

14

15

19

27

22

23

24

25

rather conservative and peaceful?

MONITOR: Slight correction: not because General MINAMI was aggressive and war-like, but because he favored peaceful relationship.

a I think General MINAMI was appointed because of his very amiable character and his administrative ability. By speaking of General MINAMI's
administrative ability, I am referring to the fact
that there was a big job to be done, since Manchuria
at that time was a hot-bed of many disputes, especially
between the police and the military police, and because banditry was still widespread, and his job was
to restore law and order.

MONITOR: Slight correction: because it was right after the time when there was an open clash between civil police and military police, and also because of guerrillas and bandits the situation was in chaos.

Q The witness in talking to the prosecution has called such a peaceful, peace loving person as General MINAMI as the originator of aggression in North China. Why is that?

A I have no recollection whatsoever of having ever testified to Prosecutor Sackett that General MINAMI was an instigator of aggressive action.

1

Q Is not the witness a sympathizer of the February 26 Incident, so-called February 26 Incident, in 1936?

4

3

A No. In the Kwantung Army I was one of the foremost advocates of a positive suppression of such action, and of all the staff officers of the Kwantung Army I should say I was the strongest exponent of such a policy.

9

11

12

Q Did the witness not advocate the retirement of all generals in activity -- from the active list immediately after the February 26 Incident?

13

A Will you repeat that question again, please?

11

Q Did the witness immediately after the February 26 Incident not advocate the retirement from the active list of all the generals?

16

18

19

20

MONITOR: Did not the witness advocate the resignation or retirement of all the generals on the active list, and did he not raise this opinion in the Kwantung Army circles immediately after the February 26 Incident?

21

A No.

25

Q Did the witness, when he was Staff Officer of the Kwantung Army, not suffer a nervous breakdown?

25

A No.

1	9 Has not the witness for this cause gone
2	into a hospital in Shinking?
3	A Yes, as a result of gas intoxication.
4	Q Does the witness know about the so-called
5	Shuiyuan Incident?
6	A Yes. By the request of Prince Teh and at
7	the order of the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung
8	Army, I went to help Prince Teh as his assistant and
9	adviser for about one month and a half, when trouble
10	arose between Prince Teh and General Putsou-yi.
11	Q Who was the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwan-
12	tung Army at that time?
13	A General UEDA, Kenkichi.
14	Q No relation with General MINAMI?
15	That doesn't require a question.
16	Q Has the witness during these last two or
17	three years met Ceneral MINAMI? I am not speaking
18	of this court room.
19	A I visited his home in Shinagawa, Tokyo, in
20	March last year.
21	Q What sort of conversations were held at that
22	time?
23	A How to save Japan from the state of hope-
24	lessness which she had been plunged into.
25	Q Has the witness not had a conversation with

25

General HINAMI at his home on the 19th of November, 1 1944? A Yes. 3 In what position was General MINAMI at that 4 time? Member of the Privy Council. A 6 In what position was the witness? 1/2 7 I was unemployed. 8 What was this talk about Mongolia? 9 At that time, because of the general situa-10 tion prevailing then, the relationship between 11 Japanese and Inner Mongolians was not very good, and 12 13 it was my contention that in order to improve this 14 condition the Hengchang Autonomous Regime should be 15 strengthened, and that this regime should be given complete independence. For this purpose I had in 17 mind the establishment of a Mongolian Society and 18 asked General MINAMI to become its president. 19 What was the answer of General MINAMI? A He said that he couldn't do so as a Privy 20 21 Councillor: 22 Does not the witness remember that he was 23 angry and that he answered if that was so he would

go and talk to the President of the Privy Council,

Mr. SUZUKI, about this matter?

A I wish that you would take back that word
"angry", because this conversation was held in a
very peaceable manner. I merely said that if General
MINAMI could not accept the post, that is, the
witness, would be glad to drop the political meaning
out of the purpose of this society, and that I would
approach the President of the Privy Council, Admiral
SUZUKI, and if Admiral SUZUKI would consent, then
that I would approach General MINAMI again to have
him reconsider the proposition.
Was the witness ever in political activities
at that time?
A Yes, most enthusiastically and ardently.
Q Can you tell us very shortly what these
political activities were?
A It was to set up General UGAKI as Prime
Minister and stop the war.
MR. MIYAKE: I am MIYAKE, counsel for the
defendant, General UMEZU.
CROSS EXAMINATION (Continued)
BY MR. MIYAKE:
Q Was the UMEZU-Ho Yinchin Agreement made
verbally?
THE PRESIDENT: Well, that won't help.

The purpose of this cross-examination should be to

11

12

13

1.1

15

10

17

151

20

22

23

24

25

show authority or justification or excuse for what the Japanese forces did in Manchuria. So far most of the cross-examination has been directed to an explanation of what they did. It should only affect punishment really. That feature may be overlooked by counsel.

Q Then I shall ask another question. Is the mission of the North China Army based on the Boxer Protocol not of the protection of the Japanese residents in the area and the protection of the communications between Tientsin and Peking?

A Yes.

Q Is the UMEZU-Ho Agreement based on the support of the Boxer Protocol not aimed at the solution of the problem of anti-Japanese activity in North China?

A Yes, if anti-Japanese activities can be removed from North China, then the duties of the garrison forces would be fulfilled.

Q Was then the objective of the signing of this agreement between General UMEZU and General Ho to eradicate anti-Japanese agitation from North China on the basis of the mission of the Japanese forces in North China and to establish an atmosphere of peace and quietness?

A Yes, of course, but not that alone.

Then was not the atmosphere, a peaceful atmosphere, created as a result of this agreement between the Japanese Army in North China and the Chinese Army?

MONITOR: Correction: forces from Nanking present in North China.

A The relationship between the armies, that is, the armies under the command of General Sung Chihyuan, was not much to speak of, but it is a fact that as a result of the ULEZU-Ho Agreement the assassination of pro-Japanese Chinese, as well as inflammatory editorials against Japan in Chinese papers disappeared.

21 22

23

24

W-	
h	
a	
1	
e	
n	
&	
D	
u d	
a	

Q When did the armies of Sung Chihyuan come from Kalgan to North China?

A I was not there at the time, so I do not remember.

Q Don't you remember at least if it wasn't after September, 1935?

A I do not recall.

Q The witness has said that the North China Autonomous Government was established at the end of December, 1935, is that correct?

A I think that the regime was set up for all practical purposes by the end of November and that a ceremony for its establishment was held around the middle of December.

Q The defendant UMEZU left North China on the first of August, 1935. How can the witness think that he has any relations with the creation of the autonomous government which was established six months after his departure?

A Colonel SAKAI, Chief of Staff of the North China Army, was the foremost proponent for the bringing of Sung Chihyuan's army to Peiping and Tientsin; and on two occasions, in March and May of 1935, Colonel SAKAI came to the Kwantung Army to ask for cooperation.

THE MONITOR: Correction: April and May 1 of 1935, instead of March. 2 A (Continuing) I was constantly in attendance 3 at the conferences which were held then. Colonel 4 SAKAI was the most ardent exponent of the policy of 5 detaching North China from the Nanking government. UMEZU said at that time that he had left it all 7 entirely to Colonel SAKAI. 9 THE MONITOR: Correction: I said that UMEZU had left the matter entirely up to SAKAI. 11 (Continuing) After that UMEZU - Ho Yingchin 12 Agreement, as a result of the Agreement, the Autonomy 13 Movement was carried on. And there is positive evi-14 dence to the effect that SAKAI carried out this 15 movement, inasmuch as I was there. It was Colonel 16 SAKAI who actually brought about the conclusion of 17 the UMEZU - Ho Agreement. I know very definitely 18 that the matter had been delegated by UNEZU... 19 THE MONITOR: And was approved of later 20 by UMEZU. 21 A (Continuing) However, in an army organization the responsibility increases the higher you go. 23 Hence, I was referring to the responsibility. 24

Q General UMEZU left his post on August 1.

1935. The Sung Chihyuan affair occurred later. And

what I would like to ask the witness is about the coming of Sung Chihyuan to North China. The witness has said he did not remember. Would he try to remember?

THE MONITOR: Slight correction: After

UMEZU left his post on the first of August, 1935,

this matter of the movement of Sung Chihyuan to the

south occurred. Now, I would like to ask the witness

what relationship UMEZU had with the establishment

of General Sung's Autonomous Regime.

And the rest of the interpretation is correct.

A We in the Kwantung Army were absolutely opposed to bringing Sung Chihyuan's Armysouthward. It was Colonel SAKAI who, in spite of the Kwantung Army's opposition, convinced the Kwantung Army and realized this plan. It is a positive fact that the UMEZU - Ho Agreement gave the Autonomy Movement in North China its impetus.

What Sung Chihyuan's Army did about the matter has no relationship, no connection whatsoever with the subject on hand. But there is no room for debate whatsoever that it was Colonel SAKAI who had engineered the whole project and that his commanding officer, the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army -- that his Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung

Army is responsible there is no room for debate.

The judgment on this question should be given by this Court.

THE MONITOR: Repeat that again.

A (Repeating) The movement of Sung Chihyuan's Army southward has nothing to do with this question. But there is no room for debate whether or not the commanding officer of Colonel SAKAI, who was a strong and ardent proponent of the Autonomy Movement was responsible or not. That question may well be decided by this Court.

Q I am not asking that. I am asking the date when General Sung Chihyuan came down southward to Peking.

A What I have not in my recollections I cannot recall, however much I try to squeeze my memory.

Q Then I shall ask you another question.

You say that Colonel SAKAI, in spite of the opposition of the Kwantung Army, brought Sung Chihyuan down to Peking. Who at that time was the superior officer, General UMEZU or General TADA?

A I did not say that Colonel SAKAI had brought General Sung down to Peiping, but what I said was that he had approached the Kwantung Army to get the Kwantung Army's approval to his plan to bring the Chinese

1 2 3 4 5	General to Peiping. Colonel SAKAI was transferred as regimental commander to Miyakonojo on the first of August. But the groundwork for the whole movement had already been laid before his departure. However, if it was since the first of August, then as you say General UNEZU would not be responsible for this plan.
7	THE PRESIDENT: That will do. We will
8	recess now for fifteen minutes.
9	(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was
10	taken until 1105, after which the proceedings
11	were resumed as follows:)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The Tribunal is now resumed.

RYUKICHI TANAKA, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

BY MR. MIYAKE (Continued):

Q I shall ask you one last question. Does the witness think that General UNEZU has not a great interest in politics or not?

A Yes. He is a man who well understands politics, but at no time -- or dislikes very much to put his fingers into politics. He is one of our senior officers who has constantly instructed us not to interfere in politics. That statement of yours I affirm.

MR. MIYAKE: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MAJOR BLAKENEY: May it please the Tribunal, I am Major Blakeney, counsel for General UNEZU, who is also represented by Japanese counsel who has just appeared. I do not intend to cross-examine, but I should like to address the Tribunal. I wish merely to point out to the Tribunal that the present witness has testified in extense about the Ho-UNEZU Agreement which apparently is to serve as the basis for

25

to request that permission.

some charge against the defendant UMEZU. THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney, are you in 2 order in intervening at this stage? 3 MAJOR BLAKENEY: Sir? 4 THE PRESIDENT: Are you in order in inter-5 vening at this stage? 6 7 MAJOR BLAKENEY: I think so, sir. THE PRESIDENT: I don't know how it can be. 8 9 If we allow you to jump up and make some explanation 10 at any stage, why not any other counsel, and there 11 are over forty of you. We must have order. 12 MAJOR BLAKENEY: Sir, I am not attempting 13 an explanation: I am attempting to lay a groundwork 14 for an objection which would have been made by the 15 Japanese counsel to whom I am assistant but for his 16 lack of knowledge of our procedure. That is the only 17 reason I have made these preparatory remarks. I 18 merely wish to note an objection. 19 THE PRESIDENT: Well, you must get the per-20 mission of the whole Tribunal to lodge even an 21 objection, seeing that you are the second counsel 22 for that particular accused. 23 MAJOR BLAKENEY: Yes, sir. I was attempting

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal will not hear

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

24

25

you, Major.

MR. OHARA: I am counsel OHARA, representing the defendant OKAWA.

THE PRESIDENT: If it be at all necessary, I would like to point out to Japanese counsel more particularly that none of the accused will be exculpated merely because it is shown, if it is shown, that the Japanese forces in China restored peace and tranquility there. What you must establish, and your cross-examination should be directed to that, is that the Japanese armed forces -- if your particular accused were connected with them in any way -- had authority or justification or excuse for what they did.

A great part of the cross-examination has been directed to show that, after all, peace and tranquility followed or was intended by the Japanese armed forces in China. Well, it is possible that if that is established the accused, so far as responsible, may have a claim to have their sentences considered. It may reduce hanging to shooting, or shooting to life, or life to a lesser term of imprisonment. That can be the only effect of it, and there is a limit to the amount of evidence in mitigation that we may receive during the course of a

trial. We may shut down on that type of evidence and hear it at the end of the trial if it becomes necessary to do so.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, if peace followed as a result of agreements between different governments, it makes no difference?

May I ask that respectfully?

THE PRESIDENT: You completely missed the point. I said peace and tranquility brought about by the Japanese forces, if it were brought about.

MR. FURNESS: Does that constitute a judgment as to whether this was aggressive warfare or not?

THE PRESIDENT: You are very impertinent.

You know that I did not pronounce any judgment.

What I said can be read and re-read, and there is nothing in the nature of a judgment in it. It is a mere warning to counsel as to what their duty is.

Your observations are gratuitous, and we will deal with you if necessary.

IR. FURNESS: I only wish to point out that the charge in the Indictment is violation of treaty rights, and it seemed to me in all respects that the 'Court's statement dealt with that. If I was impertinent, I beg the Court's pardon.

	MR. OHARA: I would like to ask the per-
mis	ssion of the Tribunal to put questions.
	CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)
BY	MR. OHARA:
	Q The witness had stated that prior to the
out	break of the Manchurian Incident there were
304	pending issues regarding Manchuria. Were they
iss	ues difficult to be solved?
	THE MONITOR: Instead of "304," it should
be	"over 300."
	A Yes. They were extremely difficult of
set	tlement.
	Q Didn't the witness state that a war without
dec	laration of war existed between China and Japan
pri	or to the outbreak of the Hanchurian Incident?
	A Yes, I did.
	Q It does not mean that the two countries
wer	e actually fighting each other, does it, in
Man	churia?
	A Yes, if by "hostilities" you mean shooting
bet	ween two opposing forces.
	Q Did you mean to say that one could never
te1	1 when and where would clashes occur between the
two	armies?

THE MONITOR: Between Japan and China.

A Yes. Could those over 300 pending issues which 2 you mentioned a while ago -- could those issues be 3 solved through military clashes in one way or the 4 other? 5 6 Will you repeat that question again clearly A 7 in Japanese? 8 Could those 300 issues be solved by 9 military force; was that what you mean? 10 I fully recognize that it would have been 11 impossible to settle these pending issues through 12 diplomatic negotiations. For purposes of settlement 13 of these issues, Mr. SHIGEMITSU, then Minister, was 14 there, and he said that in order to settle these 15 issues it may require a great deal of patience and 16 many, many years. 17 What I was asking is that because the situa-18 tion was so critical that it might explode at any 19 moment, under those circumstances would that be 20 possible to solve those issues by the clashes of 21 military forces between Japan and China? 22 It was only natural that if a clash 23 occurred the issues would be settled by the victor. 24 It is customary throughout the world that if an

armed clash occurred the issues would be settled

25

without negotiations. Would you say that, objectively speaking, 2 the two would clash eventually? 3 That is looking into the future as it was 4 seen at that time, and it was the general knowledge 5 of those of us in the army that something would 6 7 very likely and eventually occur --8 THE MONITOR: If that was left in that 9 state. 10 (Continuing) if that was left unsettled. A 11 O Didn't the witness state that he heard 12 from OKAWA that the Manchurian programs could not 13 be solved -- would not be solved by other methods 14 than the military method? That was prior to the 15 outbreak of the Manchurian Incident. 16 A Yes-17 Dian't you mean by that that it was a gener-18 ally acknowledged interpretation by the army at that 19 time? 20 Not so, Dr. OKAWA was perhaps the most 21 ardent advocate of Manchurian independence, and 22 those who participated in that movement in one way 23

or another received the influence of Dr. OKAWA.

For quite some time Dr. OKAWA entertained the hope

and ideal of Manchurian independence for the purpose

book or not.

of making of this new State a base for the liberation of all Asia. You will understand that quite readily if you would read Dr. OKAWA's book, "The Principle for the Revival of Asia."

In 1930, when I asked Dr. OKAWA who would become the leader of this new contemplated independent State, he quoted the words of one, SHIKKYO, and said that there was no other way than to revive an

Q That's enough. Answer to my question only, please. You have stated that those things were written in the book entitled "The Principle of the Revival of Asia." Have you read those points yourself? I am only asking whether you read the

extinct State and to bring combat ships -- and to

A Yes, five or six times.

Q Are those things written in that book or not?

A What do you mean?

Q The point concerning the independent country.

A Nobody said that it was written. I just heard.

Q I just asked you about it. You stated that

a state of extreme danger existed in Manchuria, and one could not foretell when it will occur, didn't you? Under those circumstances, the Kwantung Army would naturally draw out a plan of operation to meet the situation, wouldn't it? Needless, to say, if a clash occurred, the Army would immediately start operations.

Wolf & Spratt

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Q If the hostilities had occurred and areas had been occupied, would the army draw out a plan concerning the preservation of peace and order in that area?

A To whatever country an army belongs, it is only common sense that it would plan for the maintenance of law and order in occupied areas.

Q The witness stated that the Kwantung Army carried out a plan, which was prepared by the Investigation Department Bureau of the South Manchurian Railway Company, after the Incident.

A Yes.

Q Did the Investigation Bureau make the plan?

A What OKAWA told me is a fact, but I do not know whether or not this Research Bureau created this plan.

Q The witness also stated that the established -- the part of the establishment of Manchukuo -- was carried out smoothly, because it followed the predetermined plan.

A Yes, very definitely.

Q What do you mean by "accordance with the plans"? Do you mean by the words "plans," operational plans?

THE INTERPRETER: The witness just said

2

21

22

25 24

8

9

10

11

15

16

that: "I don't see where the Research Bureau plans operations."

To which the defense counsel replied: "I didn't say Research Bureau."

MR. OHARA: I made my sentences short to help the interpreter. I will make them longer now.

Q When I asked you whether the Kwantung Army would make a plan, in case a dangerous situation prevailed in Manchuria, and you replied that it would, naturally; didn't you?

A I am very familiar with the fact that Dr. OKAWA in the Research Bureau of the South Manchurian Railway had been studying matters pertaining to the occupation of areas in Manchuria after some emergency should occur. I should say that by plan, it would be that plan of occupation, inasmuch as various data were being exchanged between this Research Bureau and my own section in the Army General Staff Office, which was in charge of such matters.

I do not think that OKAWA ever stated that for the solution of Manchurian problems it was necessary -- it would be necessary to resort to arms.

It is certain that he did not say anything

3

4

6

7

S

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

22

14

25

about the use of armed forces for purposes of settlement at first; and, therefore, while being made a fool of by other people, he went to see Chang Hsueh-liang to induce him to declare independence on two occasions.

Q I will ask you about a different point now.

You used the word "control" in explaining the Manchurian Affair, but a foreigner would understand by
the word "control" a certain type of domination.

Would you explain it to me in Japanese -- the meaning of the word "control," which you used in English?

A Was it actually in control? I consciously avoided the word "domination."

Q I would like to hear your explanation of the word "control." Do you mean -- I will try to use your own expression -- do you mean by that word, to establish an area where the Chinese -- both the Chinese and Japanese people would live peacefully together, and an area in which peace would prevail, and the interest of both parties will be considered, and an area which will be convenient for both parties? Do you mean that? Do you mean by the word "control" -- do you mean to establish a zone as I have described?

A That would be in Manchuria -- that would be an ideal of Manchuria, as the Japanese had desired,

Q.

10.

but as a matter of fact, the administration of the State required the control of the Japanese army and civilian authorities. With that control what progress was made in Manchukuo would not have been possible. I saw that control in operation with my own eyes, and there is no other word than "control" to state what I mean.

Q Are you referring to the situation -- to the condition which prevailed later on?

A From our own ordinary common sense, haven't the Japanese been controlling Manchuria until very recently? As a matter of fact, the Japanese-Manchuria Treaties spoke of an inseparable relationship. That was just window dressing for Japanese control.

Q You have been using the word -- frequently using the word "control" in English, but I am trying to get your explanation, clear explanation of the meaning of that word in Japanese.

A Let me state very clearly that Manchukue was definitely a totalitarian state, over which the Japanese government exercised control by virtue of the right of inter-guidance given to the Krantung Army over the General Affairs Bureau of Manchukue.

Q You have not answered my question. However, do you mean by the word "control" to guide or to

	21
	1
	1
	2
,	
	1
1	
•	1

direct?

A I am saying that by virtue of its authority to exercise inter-guidance over the General Affairs Bureau, the Kwantung Army exercised directive authority over Manchukuo.

Q I understand you. When was it that you heard about the Manchurian Incident from OKAWA, after the Manchurian Incident?

A I have never heard about the Manchurian Incident from him.

Q You have never heard about it?

A I have heard him speak about the independence of Manchuria, but he has never spoken about any action to bring about that independence.

Q The witness stated that you spent two months in hospitals after you resigned from the Army, didn't you?

A Exactly forty-six days, to be exact.

Q Were you cured when you left the hospital?

A Yes, my insomnia was cured. However, the other disease with which I was afflicted -- that is serious anxiety over the state of affairs of my country -- that disease was not cured.

Q I heard from some sources that you were let out of the hospital by -- you paid your way out of the

9

6

7

8

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

. .

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

1	hospital; is that correct?
2	A Yes, I spent quite a bit of money, be-
3	cause I wanted to get out of the hospital as soon
4	as possible by giving away theater tickets and
5	buying fruits.
6	Q Did you tell other people about that?
7	A Yes.
8	Q Did you tell the prosecutors?
9	A Yes, inasmuch as I have to speak of facts,
10	I did.
11	Q You contracted the same disease in North
12	China in 1936; didn't you?
13	A On what grounds do you ask me that?
14	Q I am only asking.
15	A Where in North China?
16	Q I am only asking whether you contracted
17	that disease or not.
18	A I wasn't in North China. I was not in North
19	China in 1936, so I don't know.
20	Q Well then, about that time did you suffer
21	from the same kind of disease?
22	A After I had returned from Mongolia I felt
23	rather ill, and so after an examination I found that
24	I had been I was suffering from gas intoxication.
25	Q What kind of gas was it?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

20

21

23

24

25

- A Chloro. I was cured in four days.
- Q You were not sent to the hospital then?
- A I entered the hospital the 31st of December, and left on the 3rd of January.
- Q You sent a letter to the Tokyo Shimbun -- March 19th issue of the Tokyo Shimbun; didn't you?
- A I didn't send an article, but I wrote one by request.
- Q According to your letter -- in your letter you mentioned many names of prosecutors, and stated that you are -- you have very close relationships with them.
- A I did not say that I had spoke with them intimately. I said that I discussed with them.
- Q Was that letter written at the request or demand or recommendation of the prosecutors?

A Let me tell the truth. At that time it was clear that the Japanese defense counsel had no inkling whatsoever as to what grounds the prosecution was going to conduct its case. At that time it was the opinion that the defense counsel did not know how to proceed with their preparations of their cases in defending their clients; and so Mr. Joe Sano, in this courtroom -- who is now in this courtroom -- suggested that defense counsel be given some idea

as to what they would have to confront; and so I wrote the article for the purpose of educating the Japanese defense counsel.

Q You obtained the materials from the same sources, didn't you -- I mean material for your article?

A That was not an essay; that was written on the basis of the opinions given to me by Mr. Sano, and Mr. Sano is not a prosecutor. Previously, I did not reply because I did not write at the request of any prosecutor.

Q Your intention was to escape from punishment yourself, wasn't it?

A I am a soldier, and I have said very definitely that if there are any charges against me I
shall gladly go to Sugamo Prison, but to this day
the prosecution has not found any charges against me.

If you want more verification of this fact ask Joe Sano.

I am not the kind of person who would act because of
threats or because of certain reciprocatory suggestions, or a person who would try to miscontrue the
truth.

Q Where does the witness live at present?

A At the present time I am staying at the lodging prepared for witnesses at Yoyogi.

7 8

taken.)

Previously did you not used to live next door to Chief Prosecutor Keenan's residence? 2 3 Yes, I lived at the home of Mr. NOMURA, 4 whose house is located next to the Hattori house, 5 where Chief Prosecutor Keenan has his residence -by order. 7 Do you not receive your supplies -- remuner-8 ations and supplies from the prosecution? 9 Yes. While I was staying at the Nomura house 10 I received supplies of food. The supplies came to me 11 from the Prosecution Section, through Mr. NOMURA. I 12 was at the Marunouchi Hotel for ten days, but the cost 13 then was defrayed by the Japanese government. Next, 14 I went to the Hattori house; but, according to regula-15 tions at this lodging for witnesses, the Japanese 16 would have to pay twenty-eight yen a day. The supplies 17 such as food are arranged for by the manager, and he 18 serves delightful stuff. 19 Do you receive remuneration from the Allied 20 Forces? 21 I am very poor, and I would like to, but to 22 this date I have received nothing. 23 THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now to 1:30. 24 (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was

G 0 1	1
1 d	2
b e	3
r	4
&:	5
Y	6
1	7
d	8
e n	9
	10
	11
	12
	13
	14
	15
	16
	17
	18

20

21

22

23

24

25

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1334.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRUSIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

Mar. You okas he. President, just as the last witness was answering one of the questions -to one of ir. OHARA's question, he replied, I believe, that he was paid twenty-eight sen for his living expenses at this lodging which is supplied by the prosecution for witnesses; and, I believe, if I am not mistaken, the translation in English was to the effect that it was twenty-eight yen so I should like to have that correction made, if I may.

MR. SACKETT: I would like to add, if the Court please, that the witness did not state that this house was being furnished by the prosecution as just stated by counsel.

THE PRESIDENT. It is hardly worthwhile following up that subject. I do not think any Member of this Tribunal was at all impressed by what was got out in cross-examination about that.

MR. YAMAOKA. Do I understand, if your Honor

please, that the correction is not to be made? THE PRESIDENT: We will make any necessary 2 corrections; but it is a fearful waste of time to 3 bother about it. If it will please you to have the correction made, we will make it. LANGUAGE SECTION CHIEF: Mr. President, 6 according to the recollection of the personnel at 7 the table who were there prior to recess when the 8 interpreter said "twenty-eight yen," it was a slip 9 of the tongue. He should have said, "twenty-eight 10 11 sen." 12 THE PRESIDENT: The witness said "sen?" 13 That is what we want to know. 14 LANGUAGE SECTION CHIEF: Yes, "sen." 15 THE PRESIDENT: The Language Section can 16 take it in hand from now on. 17 MR. FURNESS: If the Court please --18 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Furness. 19 MR. FURNESS: I represent Mr. SHIGEMITSU. 20 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued) 21 BY MR. FURNESS: 22 General TaNaKA, on Saturday you testified that 23 for the defense of Japan, Manchuria was the base for 24 operations against the Soviet Union and that for such 25 defensive operations Japanese armies were trained in

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Manchuria. Now, the decision as to the training of such armies, whether they should be trained and the purposes for which they should be trained, were decisions which were made under the Imperial right of Supreme Command -- I think it is translated the "tosuiken" -- by the General Staff of the Army, was it not? A Yes. Made by them and not by any cabinet or any other department of the government but by the

Imperial General Staff?

Yes.

And the Commanding General of the Japanese Army in North China which was there under the treaty rights given under the Boxer Protocol, under that same system of "tosuiken", he was under the sole command of the Chief of the General Staff, was he not?

With respect to the high command, the Chief of the Army General Staff; with respect to military administration, the Linister for War.

MR. FURNESS: That is all.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Kleiman.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: Thank you.

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)
2	BY CAPTAIN KLEIMAN:
3	Q General, yesterday you told us of the Chang
4	Tso-lin Incident occurring as a result of a plan by
5	Colonel KOMOTO, do you recall?
6	A Yes.
7	Q And you also told us that the Mukden Incident
8	had been planned by a certain group of the Kwantung
9	Army, is that right?
10	A Yes.
11	Q Were the Chang Tso-lin Incident and the
12	Mukden Incident a result of a common plan or were
13	they two separate incidents?
14	A Absolutely separate.
15	Q You advise us that you had been in Shanghai
17	in the year 1932. Were you there when the Shanghai
18	Incident took place?
19	A Yes.
20	Q Was the Shanghai Incident part of a common
21	plan with respect to the Chang Tso-lin Incident and the
22	Mukden Incident, or was it separate and apart from
23	either one of those Incidents?
24	A The Shanghai Incident is an entirely separate
25	Incident.
	So that, may I understand, General, neither

of these Incidents were the result of any common plan or conspiracy to effectuate a certain purpose, is that right, sir?

A The Shanghai Incident occurred after the outbreak of the Mukden Incident as the result of which Chinese-Japanese relations became extremely aggravated. Because of the extremely acute and dangerous situation prevailing in Shanghai, the Allied Powers, with forces stationed there, stationed their forces in various specified sectors, and the clash between Japanese and Chinese forces occurred at a point where the Japanese sector met a Chinese area. The Shanghai Incident is an entirely separate Incident.

Q Sir, you told us that the inner guidance over Manchukuo belonged exclusively to the Commanding Officer of the Kwantung Army, do you recall?

A The Kwantung Army exercised the authority of inner guidance over Manchukuo by virtue of the Japan-Nanchukuo treaty; this treaty being concluded by the Japanese Government, it goes without saying that this authority was conferred upon the Kwantung Army by the Japanese Government. In Manchukuo the only person who was authorized to exercise the right of inner guidance over Manchukuo was the

25

Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army. Others, 1 whether the Chief of Staff, the Deputy Chief of 2 Staff, or the Director General of the General 3 Affairs Bureau, none of these men had the authority 4 5 to exercise this right. Is it not a fact, General, that the Commanding 6 Officer of the Kwantung Army had a similar guidance 7 over the Autonomous Committee of Inner Mongolia? 8 There was no authority of inner guidance 9 over Inner Mongolia but the Commander-in-Chief of 10 the Kwantung Army acted in accordance with directives 11 12 issued by the Chief of the General Staff with respect 13 to future operational plans north of the Great Wall. 14 This was among one of the instructions from the 15 General Staff. 16 Were the autonomous governments of which you 17 testified before this Tribunal ever recognized by 18 the Japanese Government, General? 19 No. 20 And is it not a fact that no diplomatic 21 personnel were ever sent to any of the autonomous 22 governments by the Japanese Government? 23 No, such representatives have not been sent.

And is it not a fact that the establishment

of these autonomous governments were not a result of

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

22

23

24

25

any plan wherein the Japanese Government was involved but were separate actions which were taken by the groups that you testified about?

- A No.
- Q You mean that what I have said is correct?
- A No. Shall I explain?
- Q General, you have told us this morning that you were at a hospital for treatment with respect to some gas. Is it not a fact that you were at the hospital for forty-three days for psychopathic treatment?
 - A Insomnia.
 - Q Did your mother die of melancholia?
- A No, my mother has never been taken with melancholia. She died as the result of a heart disease.
- Q Have you ever told any doctor that your mother died as the result of melancholia?
 - A No.
- When you were at the hospital at the time that you testified about, did you advise the doctors that you were suffering from hereditary syphilis?
- A No. When I was young I was quite -- I played around quite a bit and so when I was taken with insomnia, I asked the doctor for treatment, knowing

1	that if it was because of syphilis, there were
2	ready treatments for it.
3	Ç General, you told us that you have not
4	received any remuneration from the prosecution.
5	Have you been promised any remuneration in the
6	future?
7	A No.
8	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: No further questioning
9	by me.
10	THE PRESIDENT: Any further cross-examination
11	CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: No further cross-
12	examination, may it please your Honor.
13	THE PRESIDENT: Any re-examination?
14	
15	MR. SACKETT: There will be no redirect
16	examination, your Honor.
17	(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
18	MR. SACKETT: If the Court please, the
9	prosecution at this time would like to offer in
20	evidence prosecution's document No. 2194. I would
21	like to ask to have it identified.
	CLERK OF THE COURT: It will be marked 181.
22	THE PRESIDENT: What is that document,
	Mr. Sackett?
24	
25	MR. SACKETT: This is a telegram, if the
	Court please, from Consul General HAYASHI at Mukden

to Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA, dated September 19, 2 1931. THE PRESIDENT: Admitted subject to the 4 usual terms. (Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit 6 No. 181 was received in evidence.) 7 MR. SACKETT: I would like to read the 8 document. (Reading): 9 "SHOWA 6/1931/ - 12663 10 Code Despatched Mukden Sept. 19th, a.m. 11 Received This Office, Foreign Office, 12 Sept. 19th, a.m. 13 To: Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA 14 From: Consul General HAYASHI 15 No. 630 (Urgent Top Secret) 16 It is reported that TATEKAWA, Divisional 17 Director of the General Staff arrived here on the 18th 13 by the 1 PM o'clock train. This is probably true, 19 although the Army authorities keep it secret. 20 According to confidential information from Mr. KIMURA, 21 Director of the S.M.R. Co., when trackmen were sent 22 for repair work on the section reported to have been 23 damaged by the Chinese, the Army authorities forbade 24 them to approach the spot. Putting this and that 25

together, it is considered that the recent incident

was wholly an action planned by the Army." There is a certificate of translation which I am not reading. The prosecution would next like to offer in 5 evidence its document No. 2194-B. THE PRESIDENT: What is it? MR. SACKETT: This is another telegram from the same party to the Foreign Office on the same 9 date. 10 CLERK OF THE COURT: Marked 181, Part 1. 11 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 12 (Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit 13 No. 181, Part 1, was received in evidence.) 14 MR. SACKETT: (Reading) 15 "SHOWA 6 (1931) - 12672 16 Code Despatched Mukden (September 19th, a.m.) 17 Received Japanese Foreign Ministry, 18 (September 19th, a.m.) 19 To: Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA 20 From: Consul General HAYASHI 21 No: 624 22 Referring to my despatch telegram No. 623: 23 In view of the fact that it was proposed several times 24 from the Chinese side that this matter be settled in 25 a peaceful way, I phoned to Staff Officer SAKAGAKI

2

/T.N. Probably a mistake for ITAGAKI/ and said that since Japan and China had not yet formally entered into a state of war and that, moreover as China had declared that she would act upon the non-resistance principle absolutely, it was necessary for us at this time to endeavor to prevent the aggravation of the incident unnecessarily, and I urged that the matter be handled through diplomatic channels, but the above mentioned Staff Officer answered that since this matter concerned the prestige of the State and the Army, it was the Army's intention to see it through thoroughly because the Chinese Army had attacked the Japanese Army, although the Japanese Army would do their best to protect the foreign residents here. Thus since he did not appear to readily accept /my proposal/. I repeated the above purport again and called his attention to it."

22 23

> 24 25

1.

M MR. SACKETT: The next document that the r prosecution desires to offer in evidence is 2194-C. This was a similar telegram and a similar date. & THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. A (Whereupon, the document above Ъ r referred to was marked exhibit 181 part 2 7 and received in evidence.) 8 THE PRESIDENT: We are getting these telegrams 9 after they have been read by you, Mr. Sackett. Did 10 you intend that? They are handed to us after you 11 have read them. 12 MR. SACKETT: I shall wait then. May I ask 13 if distribution has yet been made of 2194-C? 14 CLERK OF THE COURT: It was marked 181 part 2. 15 MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I was 16 checking with counsel on this last document, 2194-B, 17 There is a note there "Probably a mistake for 13 ITAGAKI," and I was asking if that was the interpreta-19 tion in there or if it was actually in the telegram. 20 He says he does not know. 21 MR. SACKETT: I will have to answer that, 22 your Honor, that the request was for an accurate and 23 exact translation. I assume that is what this is. 24 I cannot read it.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not understand.

MR. SACKETT: The point in issue, if your 1 Honor please, is in the text I read there is mentioned 2 SAKAGAKI and a note "Probably a mistake for ITAGAKI." 3 To the best of my knowledge, this was stated in the 4 telegram but I did not read it. THE FRESIDENT: You want that struck out? 6 You said you were cancelling something. What do you 7 mean by that? 8 MR. SACKETT: I did not offer to cancel any-9 thing. I guess counsel asked to have it struck out. 10 I suggest that the Language Monitor straighten this 11 out, your Honor. I do not know the correct answer. 12 I assume it is in there. If it isn't, it should be 13 14 stricken. THE PRESIDENT: We will refer it to the 15 16 Language Section. LANGUAGE SECTION CHIEF: In the Japanese 17 text, Mr. President, the name is written "SAKAGAKI" 18 without any statement in brackets to the effect that 19 it probably is a mistake for ITAGAKI. 20 21 LR. SACKETT: The prosecution agrees it 22 should be stricken. 23 THE PRESIDENT: Now you may read. 24 Mk. SACKETT: (Reading:) 25

Code Despatched Mukden (September 19th, a.m.) Received Japanese Foreign Ministry, (September 19th, a.m.) 3 Foreign Minister SHIDEHARA 5 From: Consul General HAYASHI No: 625 (Urgent - Top Secret) Referring to my despatch telegram No. 618, 8 putting together reports from various quarters, it can be presumed that the army is planning to start 10 positive operations simultaneously throughout the 11 various places along the Manchurian Railway Zone. 12 I am trying, through Mr. UCHIDA, President /of the 13 Manchurian Railway Company/ who is in Dairen, to call 14 this to the attention of the Commander-in-Chief of 15 the Army. It is desired that the Government take 16 necessary steps immediately to stop the action of 17 the Army." 18 I would like next to have marked for identi-19 fication prosecution document No. 485 which is already 20 with the clerk, having been deposited pursuant to 21 order. 22 (Whereupon, the document above 23 referred to was marked exhibit No. 182 for 24 identification.) 25 MR. BROOKS; If the Tribunal please, before

we leave this other document, it refers in two of them 1 to "referring to my despatch telegram No. 623," and 2 "referring to my despatch telegram No. 618." Now, 3 none of those are related and the first one that was 4 introduced was No. 630 and I believe that it would be proper if this is going to be introduced, if there 6 is a reference, so the Court will get the full text of the meaning, that those others either should be 8 introduced at the same time or be made available to 9 counsel so we can study them and see if they should be ir troduced in our behalf. I would ask the Court 11 for a ruling as to that fact. One reason I ask that, 12 in the first telegram the last word "army," it might 13 be Japanese Army or Chinese Army. It doesn't say what. The others might clear those points up for us. 15 MR. SACKETT: To my knowledge, your Honor, 16 the prosecution does not have possession of these other 18 documents.

THE PRESIDENT: You should endeavor to get them though.

MR. SACKETT: We shall.

THE PRESIDENT: They will be necessary to a thorough understanding of the transaction.

MR. SACKETT: I might state we tried to get all those, your Honor, and got the ones that were read

7

10

14

17

19

20

21

22

23

after great difficulty, but we shall endeavor to get 1 the other ones. We do not have them now. THE PRESIDENT: If found, they should be 3 made available to the defense. 4 MR. SACKETT: The document that has just been 5 marked for identification No. 490 is a book written 6 by MATSUOKA, who was an accused prior to his decease. 7 CLERK OF THE COURT: It was No. 485. 8 MR. SACKETT: No. 485. I beg your pardon. 9 The prosecution desires to offer in evidence only a 10 part or portion or excerpt from this book. I might 11 say this portion is comprised of pages 223 to 229. 12 13 The prosecution desires to read only two paragraphs 14 but to offer these pages. 15 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 16 (Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit 17 No. 182 was received in evidence.) 18 MR. YAMAOKA: If your Honor please, we 19 should like to make objection at this time to the 20 introduction of this extract on the fact that MATSUOKA 21 is now dead. We do not think it should be properly 22 received at the present time. 23 THE FRESIDENT: It does not follow that it is

not admissible against the others. Or some of them.

MR. SACKETT: The part I desire to read

24

commences at the top of the second page of the English translation. There are two paragraphs. This appears on pages 224 and 225 of the Japanese text.

2

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Reading:) "However the position of present MANCHURIA and MONGOLIA is indispensable to the economic existence of our people as well as it being of vital importance to our national defense. In other words, when we consider it from a practical point of view, MANCHURIA and MONGOLIA are JAPAN's life-line not only for the sake of our national defense but also for our economy. Every nation has a life-line that holds the key to its existence. As GIBRALTER and MALTA are to GREAT BRITAIN, and the CARRIBEAN SEA to AMERICA, there definitely is an important point from which it is impossible to retreat if the nation expects to exist. I was referring to this point when I, in the last Diet session, spoke of the Manchurian and Mongolian policies and especially the life-line.... And, I believe the people should grasp this point! The fact that 200,000 fellow countrymen are residing there and the existence of the Manchurian Railway is not, from JAPAN's standpoint, the whole of the Manchurian and Hongolian problem. The said facts are, of course, important matters, but they are only matters which give further

importance to the problem.

"When we observe the present international relations and also the economic life of our country, we find that there is no change in the fundamental fact that MANCHURIA and MONGOLIA are areas of close connection with our country, even if there were no Japanese nor investments nor any historical relations of which we all know. In short, they are what I've been stressing, the life-line of our country. When we think of the historical relations established with the blood of our brothers, and of all the Japanese people over there, and of the great sum of investment, it is clear that we need not concede to any country nor to any person in securing and defending the areas that are the very life-line of our country."

MR. FURNESS: Might I ask whether this, which appears to be an excerpt, whether the production of the entire document has been excused under an exception to rule 6?

MR. SACKETT: It has, sir. I would next like to offer in evidence prosecution's document No. 12.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Document 12 will be marked exhibit 183.

2,

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 183 for identification.)

MR. SACKETT: This is a record of the Sakura-kai or Cherry Society for the maintenance of public peace of the Bureau of Police Affairs of the Home Ministry.

THE FRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit

No. 183 was received in evidence.)

MR. SACKETT: (Reading:) "The Cherry Society ('Sakura-kai') 1938.

"The Cherry Society is an organization which has had great influence on the March Incident and the October Incident, as well as up to the present time, and we observe in its membership list the names of persons who now hold important posts in the various departments of the ministry."

MR. BROOKS: If the Court please, this sound system -- we are getting both translations and I can not hear it over here.

MR. SACKETT: Continuing in the midddle of the first paragraph: (Reading) "According to the personal note of Lt. Col. Kiyoshi TANAKA, one of the leading members of the Cherry Society, the (nature

of the organization) is roughly as follows:

"In the midst of the above-mentioned agitated state of the domestic situation during the first ten days of September 1930, about a score of persons, under the sponsorship of Artillery Lt. Col. (Kin) HASHIMOTO of the Army General Staff Headquarters, Lt. Col. (Yoshi) SAKATA of the War Ministry and (Sue) HIGUCHI of the Garrison Headquarters, met at the Army Club ('Kaikosha') and decided to establish a research organization on the internal reorganization of the country. Later the name Cherry Society was given to this organization. Its platform was drafted by Lt. Col. Kiyoshi TANAKA, and the purport of its establishment was as follows:

"Purpose: This society has as its ultimate objective national reorganization. If necessary for the attainment of this objective, the society is ready to use armed force.

"Membership: The membership shall be limited to army officers on the active list with the rank of lieutenant colonel or below who are concerned about national reorganization and have no selfish motives.

"Preparations for the achievement of the objective: Every means shall be employed to infuse in the national army officers the necessity for a

national reorganization. The expansion and strengthening of the society's membership (about 105 members by May, 1931). The drafting of a concrete plan for national reorganization.

"Thus in January, 1931, the work of drafting a concrete plan was begun, and Lt. Cols. SAKATA, NEMOTO, HASHIMOTO and TANAKA and Captains CHO and (Ya) TANAKA were chosen as committee members.

"When we reflect on these various facts with an unselfish feeling, we feel ashamed over our blindness and extreme thoughtlessness in regard to the situation prevailing at that time.

"We shall have nothing to say even if we are said to have had devoted ourselves solely to the controlling of Communism and to have isolated ourselves from the tides of the times. At that time, there were rumors that a new start in politics was to be made, or that some people of the Social Democratic Party were trying to organize a society within the military, but we almost had no intentions of investigating into them, and of finding out why such studies were being made, and so we had been indifferent to the great tide of the times. In thinking it over, it seems that the health condition of Premier HAMAGUCHI

S

had been the main problem in those days.

"Moreover, the judgment of the situation by
the 2nd Section of the Army General Staff in SHOWA 5
(1930) was beginning to obtain unprecedented decisions.
In other words, the judgment of the situation by the
2nd Section of the Army General Staff in the past
had been solely for contributing to war operations
with only the enemy nations in mind. However, since
this year, they have come to the conclusion that, in
order to settle the Manchurian and Mongolian problems
positively, it is inevitable that our nation should
first be reconstructed, so we shall go on with the
reconstruction.

"Of course, this was attributable to the fact that there had been such influential men involved, like Lieutenant-Colonel HASHIMOTO, (Russion Group), Lieutenant-Colonel NEMOTO, (Chinese group), and many members of the Cherry Society, but I feel that it should have been fully recognized at that time that the general trend within the military had already come to this point.

"Moreover, eleven young officers, radicals among the members of the Cherry Society had met at Kaikosha on the 17th of July the same year, and had organized a Minor Cherry Society. There is a rumor

 that the members of this society were fifty-three persons including Majors CHO, MIYAZAKI and TERADA, and Lieutenant TANAKA."

For the sake of clarity, if the Court please, I would like for the Court to observe that the first name of the TANAKA mentioned in this document is different from that of the witness who was just on the stand.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we all noted that.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, there are
two TANAKAs mentioned in that document.

MR. SACKETT: If the Court please, the prosecution will now proceed by Mr. Hyder.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Hyder.

MR. HYDER: If the Tribunal please, the prosecution next introduces prosecution document No. 618.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Document 618 will be given exhibit number 184.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. .184 for identification.)

MR. HYDER: This is a letter dated the 6th of August from OZAKI, Yukio and six other members of the Citizen's Disarmament League to General MINAMI,

the then Minister of War. The letter is part of the official files of the War Ministry.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit

No. 184 was received in evidence.)

MR. HYDER: We offer this document to prove the dissemination of expansionist propaganda to the divisional officers by the accused General MINAMI in early August, 1931, which is prior to the so-called Manchurian Incident. If I might I would like to read an excerpt, if the Court please.

cussing political matters, attacking the advocates of disarmament, and appealing to the decision of military men by expounding the present situations in Manchuria and Mongolia. You have even published your views and opinions in written form. There is no doubt that your acts are an indisputable violation of the provision of the article 103 of the Military Criminal Code. Article 103 of the Military Criminal Code provides that anyone who presents a memorial to the Throne, his views to the government, or any other kind of petition concerning political matters, or gives publicity to his opinions either in a discourse or in written form shall be imprisoned for 3 years or less.

.

We expect that your spirit of observance of law will make you take some measures against what you have done. However the matter does not stop there. You have also sought to have Divisional and Army commanders drive home your opinions in and out of the army within their respective jurisdictions. Here the matter is relative to that political discussion. It goes without saying that to spread this propaganda within the Army is already an adverse act.

"The danger of spreading this propaganda outside the Army circle need not be explained.

"Furthermore, is it your Excellency's intention to pit the divisional commanders against the politicians in a dispute over the right or wrong of the political arguments?"

Mr. McManus: If your Honor please, I would like to call to the Tribunal's attention that there are two statements omitted, one and two. I do not know whether this document is covered by the exception to Rule 6b (1). I am wondering whether or not we should not be entitled to the entire document.

MR. HYDER: If the Tribunal please, that was omitted in the file of the War Ministry. Apparently the custodian of the file copied simply a part of the letter and that is the part that we have put in evidence.

MR. McMANUS: If your Honor please, it is evidently a short letter. Here is the third paragraph which is being admitted here now, and the first and second paragraphs are omitted. I do not see why we should not be entitled to the entire document.

THE PRESIDENT: You should get it, if they 1 can find it, of course. You ought to try to get it, 2 D Mr. Hyder. 3 MR. HYDER: I would be delighted. 5 & The prosecution next introduces IPS document 6 No. 2136. W h 7 DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT: 2136 will be given 8 exhibit No. 185. 9 (Whereupon, the document above 10 referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit 11 No. 185 for identification.) 12 MR. HYDER: This is a letter from the Chief 13 of the Liaison Section, Central Liaison Office, Gener-14 al Headquarters of the Supreme Commander for the 15 Allied Powers, with an enclosure, and dated June 15, 16 1946. 17 We offer this document to prove that the 13 original text of the speech made by the War Minister 19 MINAMI, Jiro, on August 4, 1931, is not immediately 20 available as within the terms of the Charter and is 21 a predicate for the introduction of secondary evidence 22 of its contents. 23 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted subject to the usual 24 terms. 25

(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit

No. 185 was received in evidence.)

2

MR. HYDER: I would like to read a part, if

(Reading) "The Central Liaison Office regrets

3

I may.

4

to state that the required copy of the text of the

5

speech has not been found in the former Ministry of

7

War, probably because it was among the documents

8

destroyed at the time of surrender.

9

"A certificate to that effect prepared by the

10

First Demobilization Ministry is attached hereto."

11

The enclosure reads in part: "The First

12 13

Demobilization Ministry does not possess the copy of the speech made by General Jiro MINAMI, the then

that document signed by six of the Disarmament Com-

mittee as evidence of the truth of the contents of

THE PRESIDENT: Are you inviting us to take

14

Minister of War, on 4 August 1931."

15

16

17

18

the document?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HYDER: Yes. I understand it is hearsay, of course. We offer it under Article 14, Section c(4), diary, letter or other statement. It was also among the archives and files of the Ministry of War.

MR. McCORMACK: On behalf of the defendant MINAMI, if the Court please, there is nothing of record here to show that this speech was ever recorded with

the War Ministry. This is just a subterfuge I will charge against the prosecution to try to put an excerpt of something in that they want to put in.

Now, if they have got a copy of the speech, a full text of the speech, I will stipulate with them to put it in.

THE PRESIDENT: We reserve our decision on all these points.

MR. HYDER: The prosecution next--

MR. FURNESS: I take it that this thing called MATSUI Diary is just a daily record of letters received in the War Ministry. I do not think it is a diary at all. If this document is admitted any crank letter which anybody wrote to the War Department, and was found in their files would be admitted. We ask that it be stricken from the record as not proof of any matter before this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Unless it calls for a disclaimer and the disclaimer could not be discovered.

MR. HYDER: May we proceed, Mr. President?
THE PRESIDENT: You may proceed.

MR. HYDER: The prosecution next introduces prosecution document No. 2135.

DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT: Document 2135, exhibit 186.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 186 for identification.)

MR. McCORMACK: On behalf of the defendant,
I want to object to the admission of this document in
evidence on account of its inadmissibility.

THE PRESIDENT: We have not heard what it is yet.

MR. HYDER: I should like that to be an identification number only on the complete file of the newspaper.

We next introduce our document No. 2135, which is an article in the Japan Times dated August 6, 1931, quoting the speech of the Minister of War Jiro MINAMI. The portions offered are the quotations of the speech of General MINAMI appearing in the article on page 1.

MR. McCORMACK: Now, if the Court please, on this document No. 2135, for the purposes of the record, it is an excerpt from an article in the Japan Times dated August 6, 1931. A copy of this paper is on two pages. Three paragraphs, the beginning three paragraphs of this document No. 2135 is an adverse editorial comment commenting on his speech by some newspaper who did not like what he said. And all that is quoted here in the speech is a few choice paragraphs

3 4

ı

2

5 6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

that somebody that did not like the speech quoted in the paper. That is all I can understand from this paper.

I should like to have the Court call on the prosecution to put in the full text of the speech because they have got it. I know they have got it. I think the Court will take into consideration in this matter the fact that when a speech is quoted in the paper and there is adverse criticism by the editor of that speech, that it cannot rely on such a speech as evidence in this case; further, that there is no authenticity attached to this particular document, The defendant is being prevented from any possibility of cross-examining the person that wrote this article, if he ever did.

THE PRESIDENT: Have you the whole speech, Mr. Hyder?

MR. HYDER: If the Court please, it is the best secondary evidence we have. We are offering the complete portion of the speech appearing in the newspaper.

MR. McCORMACK: That is not the Court's question. The Court has asked of the prosecution if it has the entire speech.

MR. HYDER: To my knowledge we do not have a

complete copy of the speech. I offered the previous document in proof of that.

THE PRESIDENT: The fact is you have not got the speech. You have got only what appears in the article?

MR. DARSEY: Mr. President, may I be heard on this issue as head of the section which is now presenting the evidence in this case?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Mr. Darsey.

MR. DARSEY: The remarks counsel has just made constitute a gratuitous challenge to the integrity of the prosecution.

We have exerted every effort to obtain the document in question, as is evidenced by the prior exhibit received in evidence. We took it up with the Supreme Command and employed its entire facilities in a search of the various government agencies of the Japanese Government in an effort to obtain the original. Our good faith is manifested on the surface of the prior exhibit received in evidence, and should further manifestation of it be required by this Court we can put the head of the investigative unit of the International Prosecution Section on this stand to explore the efforts exerted by his section to obtain the original.

I think that the Court should either require counsel to sustain the accusation which he has made or else apologize to the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: What justification have you for saying that the prosecution had the speech, Mr. McCormack?

MR. McCORMACK: Well, it has come to my attention that they have several newspapers that this speech was printed in. This particular document they have offered in evidence, 2135, indicates that there is a half dozen papers that have printed this speech.

Now, I sent my stenographer out the other day and got a copy of the newspaper. When I can do that, I know the prosecution can do ten times more. If I may, I will read it in the record here right now.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you have it, you say?
MR. McCORMACK: I have it on my desk.

THE PRESIDENT: You got it by the simple process of sending a stenographer out to get it from the newspaper.

MR. McCORMACK: I have the paper in my office. She went and got the whole newspaper for me. I do not see why the prosecution cannot do that.

THE PRESIDENT: We will reserve that decision

until after the recess. We will recess for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1450, a recess was taken until 1505, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

_

G 1 r 2 resumed. 3 n b 4 e 5 pines, is now sitting.) 6 & 7 В 8 9 Mr. Hyder. 0 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 13 19 20 21 22 particular exhibit? 23 24 heard the last word, do you? 25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The Tribunal is now

(HON. DELFIN JARANILLA, Justice, Member from the Commonwealth of the Philip-

THE PRESIDENT: I understand the IBM is out of order and that we will have a relay rendition for the balance of this afternoon's session.

MR. HYDER: If the Tribunal please, the prosecution has gone through all available newspapers, and the Japan Times is the only one that had quotes of the speech in it. The prosecution is willing for the defense to put in all the newspapers that they desire at the appropriate time, but we do believe that we have complied with the Charter as best we can. We have put in what we believe is the most accurate portion of the speech, and we have laid a predicate for the introduction of secondary evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Go ahead, Mr. Hyder.

MR. McCORMACK: Has the Court ruled on this

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know that we have

MR. HYDER: We offer this document, if the

1 Court please, in evidence to prove that the Minister 2 of War was in sympathy with the ultimate objective of the army in Manchuria.

THE PRESIDENT: I understand Mr. McCormack has a copy of the full speech. Do you admit it is a full speech?

MR. McCORMACK: If the Court please, I have in my hand a two-page typewritten copy from the Japan Chronicle of Wednesday, August 5, 1931, entitled "Army Commanders' Conference, Minister of War has Appealed to the Public, Essential Improvements"; and it is a two-page dissertation taken right from that newspaper. I have it here. I'd like to read it in so this Court will get the full benefit and not a prejudiced --

THE PRESIDENT: Now, now, you know all about procedure just as much as I do. You cannot butt in that way. You've got to wait your turn unless the prosecution agrees, and there will be no different rule here.

MR. HYDER: If the Court please, the copy that Mr. McCormack has is not a quotation of the Minister of War. It is similar to a summary of the speech. The counsel has also made the accusation that we have a copy of the entire speech. We ask the

3

4

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

basis of that accusation. 1 THE PRESIDENT: Well, he should establish 2 the accusation or, failing that, withdraw it and 3 4 apologize. MR. McCORMACK: Now, there has been no 5 showing to this Tribunal that the prosecution has 6 contacted any of the newspapers that the speeches 7 are alleged to have occurred in --8 9 THE PRESIDENT: Now, let us get --MR. McCORMACK: (Continuing) as to their 10 11 document. THE PRESIDENT: You said that you knew the 12 prosecution had the full speech. The Members of this 13 Tribunal take that accusation seriously. They want 14 15 you to establish it or, failing that, to withdraw it 16 and apologize. That is now the point to be dis-17 cussed. 18 MR. McCORMACK: Now, if the Tribunal follow 19 me, this speech was made on the fourth of August --20 THE PRESIDENT: Why did you say the prose-21 cution had the speech? 22 MR. McCORMACK: Let me explain, please. 23 That newspaper or volume that they put in evidence

there - they've got a slip of paper marking the speech

that they want to be put in. Now, if you look on the

25

day before, on August 5 in that volume, you'll see
a whole two-page article on his speech. They don't
point that out to the Court. Each of these mewspapers have published several kinds of speeches in
their issues at that time.

THE PRESIDENT: We are going to keep you
to the point. Why did you say the prosecution had
the full speech?

MR. McCORMACK: Because I have been told
that they have.

THE PRESIDENT: Who told you?

MR. McCORMACK: I have heard around. I

MR. McCORMACK: I have heard around. I can't put my finger on the person or persons who told me at this minute, but I have been tipped off that they have several articles on this speech. And when I was served with this copy showing me that there was a copy that was about to be introduced, in the shape it was with the critical opinion of some editor who put it in this paper, then I had no reason to doubt the veracity of that suggestion to me.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, that's all you have to go on.

MR. McCORMACK: That's right. If you look at the date -- the paper in that volume that was issued before the one they are introducing in issue

here -- you will see a large dissertation on the 1 speech of the War Minister at that time. And this 2 speech, two days after, that they are introducing --3 two days after he made it -- is some criticism of it. 4 That's the thing they want to introduce. They don't 5 introduce everything or point out everything about 6 the speech so we can even lay our hands on it. 7 THE PRESIDENT: In the face of the prose-8 cution's denial, we don't think that you have suf-9 ficient material upon which to base your accusation, 10 and we think the proper course for you is to with-11 draw and apologize. We are not going to allow this 12 Tribunal to be used for the making of false accusa-13 tions by one side or the other. 14 MR. McCORMACK: I am sorry. 15 THE RESIDENT: Well, you withdraw, do 16 17 you? 18 MR. McCORMACK: Pardon? THE PRESIDENT: You withdraw the accusation 19 20 and you apologize? 21 MR. McCORMACK: Yes. THE PRESIDENT: You didn't do it very 22 23 gracefully. 24 Mr. Hyder. MR. HYDER: We offer the quotations of the 25

speech in evidence, if the Tribunal please. 1 DEPUTY CLERK OF THE COURT: To be marked 2 exhibit 186, part 1. 3 (Whereupon, the document above 4 referred to was marked prosecution's exhib-5 it No. 186, part 1 for identification.) 6 7 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted subject to the 8 usual terms. 9 (Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit 10 No. 186, part 1 was received in evidence.) 11 MR. HYDER: I should like to direct the 12 Court's attention to specific excerpts appearing in 13 the speech as quoted in the article. 14 "Some other observers, without studying the 15 conditions of neighboring foreign countries" -- does 16 the Court have a copy? 17 THE PRESIDENT: We have the article. 18 MR. HYDER: Third paragraph under "What He 19 Said." 20 "Some other observers, without studying the 21 conditions of neighboring foreign countries, hastily 22 advocate limitation of armaments and engage in propa-23 ganda unfavorable for the nation and the army." 24 Beginning again, the first paragraph at the 25 top of page 2:

"Manchuria and Mongolia are very closely related to our country from the viewpoint of our national defense as well as of politics and economics.

"It is to be regretted that the recent situation in that part of China is following a trend unfavorable to our Empire.

"The recent change in international politics and the recent decline of Japan's prestige coupled with the recent ascendancy of anti-foreign agitation and new economic power in China, are responsible for such a tendency, which is a menomenon of permanent duration instead of being a passing one:

"In view of such a situation, I hope you will execute your duty in educating and training the troops with enthusiasm and sincerity so that you may serve the cause of His Majesty to perfection."

We next introduce, and ask to have identified by exhibit number, the entire file of the admissions of the accused ARAKI, Sadao.

MR. McMANUS: Mr. President, when General ARAKI was interviewed at Sugamo Prison, on many occasions he complained of the interpretation of his statements, and on at least two occasions the interpreter who appeared with the prosecutors admitted himself that he appeared to be not qualified to

1 2

interpret the statements of General ARAKI. I am sure that Mr. Hyder and Colonel Morrow, who were the prosecutors at the time, will bear me out on this point.

Furthermore, because of this complaint, General ARAKI requested the prosecutors if he could submit voluntary statements of his own, to which they agreed. These three voluntary statements were produced by the accused ARAKI, and I understand — I only have one of them, and I understand from the accused ARAKI that the one is utterly useless without the other two as the three of them give the whole picture and a full explanation of his statements that he wanted to make.

I have gone over the interrogatories with the accused ARAKI and my co-counsel, and I have picked out myself eleven glaring errors in the statements that Mr. Hyder has contained in his file. Now, because of these errors and the difficulty of interpretation and the consideration that was given to the accused ARAKI in permitting him to offer these three statements, I am going to request the Tribunal not to accept these statements because of the errors. However, if the Tribunal does permit the acceptance into evidence of the statements, I sincerely

request that the three voluntary statements be also 1 produced by the prosecutor. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Those mistakes must be 3 referred to the Language Section. 4 MR. McMANUS: Yes. Well, I'd like to 5 further object, if the Court please --6 7 LANGUAGE ARBITER (Major Moore): If the Court please, were those mistakes translation mis-8 9 takes? 10 MR. McMANUS: Yes. Many names were wrong. 11 THE PRESIDENT: Better not have any de-12 tailed discussion. 13 MR. McMANUS: I'd like to inquire at this 14 time whether the prosecutor intends to read excerpts 15 from the statements or whether he is offering the 16 entire interrogatories. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

W 2 3 & 4 S prat 6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

MR. HYDER: If the Tribunal please, the prosecution has introduced all the admissions of the accused, ARAKI, for identification and for future reference. The prosecution is only offering specific excerpts from that interrogation. The defense can do the same.

MR. McMANUS: Your Honor has said, on many occasions, that there would be no review of this case. However, if excerpts are going to be read, I must reiterate my objection most strenuously, Mr. President, because to my mind the prosecution here, by reading these excerpts -- half sentences, half paragraphs, are building up a beautiful running story, as they would like it, which as interpreted from the record will show inferences which are not actually the full truth because of the half sentences, half paragraphs; and making a beautiful running story as they would like the facts to be. So I ask your Honor not to permit the reading of exceprts into the record.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not understand your reference to the fact that I said there was no review, or suggested there was not. The fact that there is no review does not influence our decisions in any way, interlocutory or otherwise. I did not like the observations when I was asked to note

24

certain exceptions.

THE MONITOR: Will you read back slowly, please.

(Whereupon, the statement of the President was read by the official court reporter.)

THE PRESIDENT: (Continuing) You can always read into the record at the appropriate time such of the interrogatories or the answers, or both, as have not been used by the prosecution. In Chambers I directed that you should have the whole of the interrogatories and answers of the accused. That is the most I could do for you, having regard for normal procedure in any court.

MR. McMANUS: Do I understand then, Mr. President, that the prosecution will produce the three voluntary statements of the accused, ARAKI, together with the other interrogatories.

MR. HYDER: Mr. President, I do not understand Mr. McManus's request that I personally have given him one statement by the accused ARAKI. I have made available, and told him that he could have, a second statement of the accused, ARAKI. The third I do not know anything about. If we have it he is welcome to it.

MR. McMANUS: That, Mr. President, is exactly 1 the point. Naturally, the prosecutor should have it, 2 and I want it. He took the statement from ARAKI, and 3 whether or not I am going to get it I do not know. 4 Mr. Hyder dces not know whether the prosecution has 5 that third statement. 6 THE PRESIDENT: The prosecution says they 7 have not got it. We will take their word for it for 8 the time being. 9 The objection is overruled, and we ask you 10 to proceed, Mr. Hyder. 11 MR. HYDER: We next introduce --12 CLERK OF THE COURT: The tender, all per-13 taining to the same subject, will receive the same 14 exhibit number. Therefore, the prosecution document 15 No. 2248 will be exhibit No. 187 A; 2249, 187 B. 16 MR. HYDER: May I explain: These are the 17 admissions by day; for example, the first is the 12th 18 of March on our prosecution filing system. It is our 19 20 document 2248, and so on. CLERK OF THE COURT: Yes. Do you wish to 21 22 have each one of them --23 MR. HYDER: Yes. CLERK OF THE COURT: -- identified? 24 25 MR. HYDER: That is correct.

CLERK OF THE COURT: So No. 2250 will be 1 No. 187 C; 2251, 187 D; 2252, 187 E; 2253, 187 F; 2 2254, 187 G; 2255, 187 H; 2256, 187 I; 2257, 187 J; 3 2341, 187 K; 2342, 187 L; 2343, 187 M; 2344, 187 N; 4 2345, 187 0; 2346, 187 P; 2347, 187 Q; 2348, 187 R; 5 6 2349, 187 S; 2350, 187 T; 2351, 187 U; 2352, 187 V; 7 and 2353, 187 W. 8 (Whereupon, the documents above referred 9 to were marked prosecution's exhibits as 10 above indicated, for identification.) 11 THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. 12 (Whereupon, prosecution's exhibits 13 as above indicated were received in evidence.) 14 MR. McMANUS: Mr. President, if those excerpts 15 are going to be read, may I request the prosecutor to 16 note where there is a break, and not read them as a 17 running story? 18 THE PRESIDENT: As a matter of grace, he may 19 do so when some interrogatories or the answers thereto 20 are read, and note others if that course is not taken. 21 MR. HYDER: We offer our IPS exhibit No. 22 10005, which are the admissions of ARAKI taken on 23 February 15 at ten o'clock and twelve o'clock. 24 CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution No. 10005, 25 received as exhibit No. 188 A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit
No. 188 A, for identification.)

MR. HYDER: We offer this portion as the admissions of the accused, ARAKI, to prove that the accused, ARAKI, decided soon after becoming Minister of War, December 13, 1931, that the four provinces under Chang Hsueh-liang should be pacified and occupied.

MR. McMANUS: Mr. President, I do not want to be burdensome to the Tribunal, but I think this is rather important to the accused, ARAKI. This is

MR. McMANUS: Mr. President, I do not want to be burdensome to the Tribunal, but I think this is rather important to the accused, ARAKI. This is one of the points where he said he never used the word "occupied," that he used "restore law and order," and it was translated "occupied." It makes quite a difference.

THE PRESIDENT: If he wants us to take his word for it, there is one place from which we will take it, and that is the witness box.

MR. HYDER: I read the exhibit appearing on page 4:

"Q When did you decide in your own mind that the four provinces under Chang Hsueh-liang should be pacified and occupied?

"A Soon after I became War Minister."

We next introduce prosecution's exhibit
No. 10006, being the admissions of ARAKI, Sadao,
taken February 19, 1345 to 1630, Sugamo Prison, page 1.
CLERK OF THE COURT: 10006, marked exhibit
188 B.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 188 B, for identification.)

THE PRESIDENT: The last two documents will be admitted on the usual terms.

(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit No. 188 A and exhibit No. 188 B were received in evidence.)

MR. HYDER: We offer this portion of the admission of ARAKI to prove that as Minister of War the accused ARAKI consulted the Frime Minister, the Navy Minister, the Finance Minister, and the Secretary of the Cabinet, on his proposed military budget to pacify and occupy these provinces; that all agreed at this preliminary conference.

The answer -- reading his answer:

"After I became War Minister, I discussed
the policy of the occupation of General Chang's four
provinces to clear up the Manchurian situation. After
I had made the plan up myself with the Prime Minister,

the Foreign Minister, and the Finance Minister, all agreed with me. The Prime Minister approached the Privy Council for approval." We next introduce prosecution exhibit No. 10001. CLERK OF THE COURT: Exhibit 188 C. (Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 188 C, 8 9 for identification.) MR. HYDER: These are the admissions of ARAKI 10 taken February 7, February 8, and February 11, 11 THE PRESIDENT: The last document is admitted 12 13 subject to the usual terms. 14 (Whereupon, prosecution's exhibit No. 188 C 15 was received in evidence.) 16 MR. HYDER: We offer these admissions to 17 prove that an agreement having been reached the Prime 13 Minister took the request for the budget to the Emperor, 19 who, in turn, requested the Privy Council to discuss and 20 pass on the advisability; that the Privy Council, with 21 the Cabinet and Emperor present, approved on and around 22 December 17, 1931, the proposed military budget to be 23 used to pacify and occupy these four provinces. 24 Firstly, I should like to read only specific

portions in the interest of time, beginning with the

25

1

2

4

question, page 6 of the interrogation of the 7th of February: "Q General, you ordered the extension of the Japanese occupation in Manchuria from the time you 4 became Minister of War? 5 "A After a policy has been decided by the 6 government, orders for operations would be issued 7 by the Chief of the General Staff. The War Minister 8 has no right to issue orders in connection with oper-9 ations. In other words, policies would be decided by 10 the government and the carrying out of this policy 11 would be effected by the General Staff, and the 12 policy was to bring peace and order to territory under 13 14 Chang Hseuh-liang. 15 "@ Who decided that policy? "A The policy would be decided by the government. 16 "Q By the government, General, do you mean the 17 13 Cabinet or the War M, nistry? 19 "A The Cabinet. "B At what time did the Cabinet decide on this 20 21 policy? "A This was decided at the time it was decided 22 23 to request an increase in expenditures.

"Q What date?

"A It was in December. I do not remember.

1

2

3

24

1 "Q 1931? 2 "A Yes. 3 "Q While you were War Minister? 4 "A Yes. Until this time there had been no fixed 5 policy, and it was realized that the absence of policy 6 would result in the spreading of hostilities. It had 7 been decided that the three provinces comprising Chang 8 Hsuchliang's territory required pacification, but a 9 statement by Chang Hsuch - liang to the effect that his 10 jurisdiction extended over four territories expanded 11 the scene of activities to Jehol. Chang Hsueh-liang 12 was originally at Ching Chow. He later withdrew to 13 Jehol from where he conducted his government. 14 "Q Then, in December, 1931, the Cabinet decided 15 to pacify those four provinces under General Chang? 16 "A Yes. 17 "Q General, going back to your policy decided 18 by the Cabinet in December, 1931, were all the members 19 of the Cabinet there when the decision was made? 20 "A They were all there." 21 Continuing to page 4 of the interrogation of 22 the 8th of February, the middle of page 3 of excerpts: 23 "Q Did the Cabinet agree that you should occupy 24 those four provinces with the Army? 25

"A Yes, and the soldiers would not have been able to move without a Cabinet approval, as appropriations would not have been available.

"Q The Cabinet approval was a part of the policy decided on December 17th. Was that a part of the policy, the occupation by Japanese troops of the four provinces?

"A This is a very complicated matter and I am not able to say whether the Cabinet's approval was a part of the policy or not, but I would point out that the Prime Minister and all the other ministers gave their approval to this policy. Otherwise it could not have been carried out.

"Q When did they give their approval?

"A The policy was actually decided at the Privy Council meeting at which all members were present and also representatives from the Cabinet and perhaps the Emperor.

"Q Did the Emperor say anything at that meeting?

"A The Emperor is always present at an extraordinary meeting of the Privy Council.

"Q Was the Emperor there then?

"A The Emperor was present, but he did not take part in the discussion.

"Q General, were you there?

1	"A The Cabinet was present in force.
2	"Q That includes you?
3	"A Yes, and all members of the Privy Council.
4	"Q Do you know whether the Emperor approved of
5	this policy?
6	"A When the Privy Council has reached a unani-
7	mous decision, this is reported to the Emperor, who
8	gives his consent.
9	"Q Is that a written consent?
10	"A No, this is not a written consent. The desire
11	of the Privy Council is conveyed by word of mouth to
12	the Emperor. The Emperor actually says nothing at this
13	meeting. After hearing the decision, he retires. If
14	there are any written records, the Secretary of the
15	Cabinet should have knowledge of them.
16	"Q Do you know whether these records have been
17	destroyed?
18	"A I am not in the Cabinet now, but I do not
19	know; but I imagine they have all been destroyed."
20	THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn now until
21	9:30 tomorrow morning.
22	(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment
23	was taken until Wednesday, 10 July 1946, at
25	0930.)